



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON HORACE *SERM.* i. 4. 26

In the *Classical Review* XIV (1900) 126, I gave some arguments in favor of the reading "aut ab avaritia aut misera ambitione laborat," which still seem to me sound. In the *Revue de phil.* XXXI (1907), 58, M. Paul Lejay published some criticisms of my view, which doubtless seemed to those who read them, as they did to me on a cursory inspection, somewhat forcible. They will not, however, bear the test of careful examination.

In the first place it is a little disingenuous to speak of "trois ou quatre textes où *laborare* serait construit avec *ab*," for I cited five passages, to which M. Lejay himself added two, and there is at least one more. In order to reach his conclusion that "*laborare ab avaritia est pour Horace et pour son temps* une construction suspecte" (the italics are mine), he is obliged to dispose of the example in Varro *R.R.* ii. 2. 17 by attempting to show that it is not a parallel to *a frigore laborantibus* in Plin. *N. H.* xxxii. 133, of which he seems to admit the cogency.

Now to say nothing of the fact that in the *Thes. Ling. Lat.* (I 31, 11) the two examples are given side by side, M. Lejay's interpretation of Varro's words seems to me very doubtful, if not incorrect. The passage reads as follows: "cum depulsi sunt agni a matribus, diligentia adhibenda est ne desiderio senescant. Itaque deliniendum in nutricatu pabuli bonitate et a frigore et aestu ne quid laboretur curandum. Cum oblivione iam lactis non desiderat matrem," etc. It will be seen that Varro, after speaking of *agni*, passes to the individual *agnus*, which is obviously to be supplied as the subject of *desiderat* (cf. "castrare oportet agnum" farther on in the same passage). *Agnus* then is to be supplied also as the subject of *laboret*, and the failure of some scribe to understand this shift accounts for the variant reading *laborent* (sc. *agni*). We should further supply *agnum* with *deliniendum*; for the construction cf. *R.R.* i. 20. 2, "hos veteranos ex campestribus locis non emendum in dura et montana" and Cic. *De sen.* 6, "viam quam nobis ingrediendum sit." On the other hand, I can find no parallel for the absolute and impersonal use of *laboret* which M. Lejay apparently favors (his translation is "rien ne doit laisser à désirer"), while to make this verb impersonal and to take *deliniendum* without an object, seems too harsh even for Varro.

A *frigore* too is to be connected with *laboret* in exactly the same way as in the passage from Pliny, as is suggested by the chiasmic order; cf. also the *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, loc. cit.

Since the use of *ab aliquo laborare* is thus carried back to the time of Varro, it is perhaps unnecessary to discuss the other passages. Livy ix. 19. 15, "numquam ab equite hoste . . . laboravimus," is given in the Thesaurus with the two passages just discussed. I should agree with M. Lejay in seeing here a different use of *ab*, without however admitting that this affects my argument in the least. The example from *Bell. Afr.* 5

obviously cannot be separated from the one from Livy. I should be inclined to see in both these passages the use of *ab* with the ablative denoting agency; cf. "*ab aliquo male audire, ab aliquo cadere*" (= *caedi*), and the like; and to translate "suffer at the hands of the cavalry."

Caesar's *a re frumentaria laborare* forms a class by itself, and as M. Lejay rightly says, the ablative is one of respect; cf. also *Thes. Ling. Lat.* I 35, 20. But although the two passages from Caesar might be spared without weakening the case for *ab avaritia* seriously, I believe that the shift of meaning from *ab equite laborare* to *a re frumentaria laborare* is an easy one, and that these two examples belong with the rest; cf. "*re frumentaria non premi*," *Caes. B. G.* v. 28. 5.

In a lexicon article on *ab*, then, the examples of *ab aliquo laborare* would rightly and properly be put under different heads, since from the general signification "from," indicating the source or origin of the trouble, the context gives various shades of meaning, cause, agency, and respect. M. Lejay's feeling for the constructions, except in the case of the passage from Varro, seems to me absolutely sound. In an article on *laborare*, however, I do not see how these passages could be separated, for the close connection of the various uses, and the development of one meaning from the other, is clear. To judge from the writers who use it, *ab aliquo laborare* may well belong to the colloquial language, which is an additional argument for the use of the construction in the *Satires*, while the bold or inexact *a re frumentaria laborare* may have arisen in the *sermo castrensis*.

It may be admitted that a decision between the rival readings is not an easy matter. On the side of *ob avaritiam* we have the all but unanimous agreement of the manuscripts, and in these days conservatism in such cases is the rule. *Ab* and *ob*, however, were frequently confused (see Lindsay *Introd. Text. Emend.* 73, and the examples there cited), and when the change from *ab* to *ob* took place, that of *avaritia* to *avaritiam* inevitably followed. We have only to carry these changes back far enough, to dispose of the evidence of the manuscripts, and the cases in which the true reading has been preserved by a very few inferior codices, or has been lost in all the MSS, are sufficiently numerous; note for example *mi* for the impossible *mihi* of *Serm.* i. 3. 23. If we read *ob avaritiam*, we must credit Horace with a construction with *laborare* to which there is no parallel in our extant literature, while *ab aliquo laborare, ex aliquo laborare*, and the simple ablative occur frequently. Surely the evidence against *ob avaritiam* is not to be lightly brushed aside.

The inconcinnity to which Bentley objected is certainly not of enough weight to balance the manuscript tradition, although it may well be doubted whether parallels from such artists in inconcinnity as Sallust and Tacitus are especially convincing. M. Lejay's parallels from Horace seem to me somewhat forced.

JOHN C. ROLFE